The AI Overview isn't a summary – it's a misinterpreting chatbot

generative-ai

Bitu79 1 July 1, 2026, 2:03am

Google's AI Overview is not a real "web summary".
It is an automatically running chatbot that often misinterprets, mixes, and distorts online content.
The system pulls pieces from different forum threads, combines them incorrectly, and produces text that does not reflect what the original posts actually say.

It also misinterprets my own posts: content written in separate threads is merged into one, as if it were multiple people's opinions.
This distorts the meaning and creates a misleading picture for users.

The feature runs automatically, cannot be turned off, and Google presents the output as if it were an accurate, official summary of the web.
At the bottom, it simply adds "AI may make mistakes", as if that disclaimer excuses the fact that the system is rewriting and misrepresenting original author content.

There is also a clear copyright violation: the AI Overview takes my author content, rewrites it, and then labels *Google* as the source.
This means the system is presenting user-generated material as Google's own content, which is both misleading and a form of intellectual property theft.
The author's work is being republished under Google's name without consent or attribution.

The core issue: a malfunctioning chatbot is producing distorted text, while Google displays it as a trustworthy web summary and even claims authorship of the rewritten material.




UI vs. Storage Realities: Discussions suggest the files might be retained by Google Drive or server-side cache systems for varying grace periods rather than being immediately purged.
GDPR Compliance Claims: While Google's policies generally aim to meet standard data processing and retention requirements, developers report inconsistencies in how the backend handles permanent deletion compared to simple file removal.
Community Resources
To review the full technical analysis and community claims, refer to the following forum discussions on the Google AI Developers Forum and the related GDPR and Deletion Failure Report thread.
Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure...
Google AI Developers Forum
regarding data handling?
Are you dealing with custom API logs versus UI-created prompts?
I can help clarify the exact data pipeline and retention intervals applicable to your specific project tier.
Az AI hibázhat, ezért ellenőrizze a válaszait.
Kérdezzen bármit
Google AI Developers Forum
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
2026. jún. 10. — During my own tests inside my account, it became absolutely clear that Google AI Studio does not delete prompts, even when the user deletes ...
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Proven intentional data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
2026. jún. 12. — What this proves: * The JSON file stored in Drive is NOT the actual chat. * The AI...
Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and ...
2026. máj. 4. — Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and functional for 32 days...
Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (...
2026. jún. 7. — Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (GDPR-Relevant –...


Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio – developers are required to re
Összes
AI-alapú áttekintés
Recent forum discussions indicate mixed opinions and concerns among developers regarding data deletion in Google AI Studio. Some users report that supposedly "deleted" chats and prompts remain accessible via direct URLs or are recoverable beyond intended deletion periods, prompting data privacy and GDPR concerns.
Key De
UI vs.
GDPR Compliance Claims: While Google's policies generally aim to meet standard data processing and retention requirements, developers report inconsistencies in how the backend handles permanent deletion compared to simple file removal.
Community Resources
To review the full technical analysis and community claims, refer to the following forum discussions on the Google AI Developers Forum and the related GDPR and Deletion
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and ...
Proven intentional data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and ...
Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (...


Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio – developers are required to re
AI-alapú áttekintés
Recent forum discussions indicate mixed opinions and concerns among developers regarding data deletion in Google AI Studio. Some users report that supposedly "deleted" chats and prompts remain accessible via direct URLs or are recoverable beyond intended deletion periods, prompting data privacy and GDPR concerns.
Because the backend retention and sync process differs fundamentally from frontend UI updates, developers are actively sharing evidence and demanding clarification on storage lifetimes.
Community Resources
To review the full technical analysis and community claims, refer to the following forum discussions on the Google AI Developers Forum and the related GDPR and Deletion


Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio – developers are required to re
AI-alapú áttekintés
Recent forum discussions indicate mixed opinions and concerns among developers regarding data deletion in Google AI Studio. Some users report that supposedly "deleted" chats and prompts remain accessible via direct URLs or are recoverable beyond intended deletion periods, prompting data privacy and GDPR concerns.
Because the backend retention and sync process differs fundamentally from frontend UI updates, developers are actively sharing evidence and demanding clarification on storage lifetimes.
Key Developer Findings & Debates
Persistent Backend Access: Some users have documented instances where deleted prompt data remains processable by backend models, and share links continue to function even after the UI indicates data has been wiped.
Community Resources
To review the full technical analysis and community claims, refer to the following forum discussions on the Google AI Developers Forum and the related GDPR and Deletion


Google
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio – developers are required to rep
AI-mód Összes Hírek Videók Képek Rövid videók Web Egyebek Eszközök
AI-alapú áttekintés
Recent forum discussions indicate mixed opinions and concerns among developers regarding data deletion in Google AI Studio. Some users report that supposedly "deleted" chats and prompts remain accessible via direct URLs or are recoverable beyond intended deletion periods, prompting data privacy and GDPR concerns.
Key Developer Fi
Community Resources
To review the full technical analysis and community claims, refer to the following forum discussions on the Google AI Developers Forum and the related GDPR and Deletion
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Proven intentional data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and ...
Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (...
Google AI Developers Forum
Képernyőkép a vágólapra másolva
Automatikusan mentve a képernyőképek mappába.
Korrektúra és megosztás


Google
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio – developers are required to rep
AI-mód Összes Hírek Videók Képek Rövid videók Web Egyebek Eszközök
AI-alapú áttekintés
Recent forum discussions indicate mixed opinions and concerns among developers regarding data deletion in Google AI Studio. Some users report that supposedly "deleted" chats and prompts remain accessible via direct URLs or are recoverable beyond intended deletion periods, prompting data privacy and GDPR concerns.
Because the backend retention and sync process differs fundamentally from frontend UI updates, developers are actively sharing evidence and demanding clarification on storage lifetimes.
Key Developer Findings & Debates
Community Resources
To review the full technical analysis and community claims, refer to the following forum discussions on the Google AI Developers Forum and the related GDPR and Deletion
Proven data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Proven intentional data retention after deletion in Google AI Studio
Deleted chats in Google AI Studio remain fully accessible and ...
Evidence of Google AI Studio Data Retention and Deletion Failure (...
Google AI Developers Forum





[AI Overview Content Theft Report – Google Is Re-Generating My Posts Without Proper Attribution]

[Most People Don't Even Understand the Problem — and That's Exactly Why Google Gets Away With]

Everything

Bitu79 2 July 1, 2026, 2:36am

The search result boxes show my original post, with the real source and the real content. Nothing is hidden there — the search result boxes clearly display my original work. The problem is not with the boxes, but with the AI Overview. The Overview takes the content from those search result boxes as its source, and then generates a separate AI text from it. This generated text distorts what I originally wrote, misunderstands it, mixes it up, and produces a version that no longer reflects my actual words.

Google then publishes this distorted AI text on the web under its own name, as if it were an official "web summary." The feature cannot be turned off, it runs automatically, and users see Google as the "source," even though the AI Overview is producing a twisted version of my original work. This is copyright theft, because Google is presenting an AI-generated distortion of my content under its own branding, and exposing a modified version of my original work to the public without my consent.

Bitu79 3 July 1, 2026, 2:52am

https://archive.ph/e032S

https://archive.ph/e032S/image

https://web.archive.org/web/20260701021011/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148

Bitu79 4 July 1, 2026, 3:42am

I have written 38 posts on the Google AI Developers forum. In these posts, I described my issues in detail, included the letters I sent to the Google DPO, the DPO's email address, my official complaints, my GDPR requests, and every piece of evidence showing that I contacted Google formally. Google received and signed my registered letters, which means they officially acknowledged my submissions.

Despite this, Google does not respond to anything. They do not reply to my letters, my emails, my complaints, my GDPR requests, my evidence, or even the reports I posted on their own forum. Under GDPR, they must respond within 30 days, but they do not. This violates my right to information and access.

Meanwhile, Google's AI mode uses my content. The AI reads my posts, processes the content, summarizes it, interprets it, generates new text from it, makes incorrect statements about me, and displays it on Google's interface when someone searches. This is data processing and content usage.

The AI speaks about me in Google's name. Its answers include statements like "Google handles this by…", "Google responds by…", "Google does…", even though in reality Google does nothing, does not respond, does not communicate, and completely ignores me.

The most important part: the AI is not a separate entity. The AI is not an independent actor, not a separate company, not a "thinking being." The AI is a machine. The machine is operated by Google. The machine runs on Google's servers. The machine is part of Google's system. Therefore, it is impossible for Google to "not know about me" while the machine they operate clearly does.

The signed registered letters prove that Google officially knows about me. The AI's answers prove that Google's system technically knows about me. Together, these facts mean Google cannot claim "we didn't receive it," "we don't know about it," or "we didn't see it."

This is why the situation is absurd: Google officially acts as if they do not know about me, while their own system proves that they do. The AI can only analyze my posts because Google's system has read them. If the machine knows about me, then Google knows about me. If the machine processes my complaint, then

Google's system processes my complaint. If the machine speaks about me, then Google's system speaks about me.

This is a legal contradiction, a data-processing failure, and unauthorized content usage. I did not give permission for my content to be used. I explicitly reported the issue. I formally contacted Google and the DPO. Google does not respond. The AI still uses my content, speaks about me in Google's name, includes my complaint in its answers, and shares it with others when they search.

This is why I ask: on what legal basis are they using my content if Google does not respond to me?
The answer: on no legal basis.

All of my posts can be found here.

https://discuss.ai.google.dev/u/bitu79/activity/topics

Bitu79 5 July 1, 2026, 3:45am

https://web.archive.org/web/20260701034433/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148

Bitu79 6 July 1, 2026, 4:04am

In my fourth post, I put together a legal and logical chain that Google cannot get around. This post is especially important because it proves that Google knows about me both officially and technically, yet they act as if I do not exist. These two facts together are legally indefensible.

1. The machine's knowledge = Google's knowledge

The AI is not an independent actor.
The AI is a machine.
The machine is operated by Google.
The machine runs on Google's servers.
The machine is part of Google's system.

Therefore, if the machine knows about me, then Google knows about me.
This is not an opinion but a legal fact: the information processed by the AI counts as Google's knowledge.
Google cannot claim "we didn't know" while their own system processes and publishes my complaint.

2. Google's system gives the public a false impression

The AI makes statements in Google's name such as "Google handles this," "Google responds to this," while in reality Google does nothing. This is not a simple mistake — it is misleading. Their system generates answers that create the illusion that Google is dealing with my complaint, while my signed registered letters prove that Google is completely ignoring me.

Together, this is a textbook example of deceptive corporate communication.

3. The amount and weight of the evidence

38 posts on their own forum.
Officially received and signed registered letters.
Months of failure to respond despite the mandatory 30-day deadline.
Continuous AI processing and publication of my content.

This is not an administrative error.
This is not accidental.
This is not a "lost email."
This is intentional ignoring while their system actively works with my content.

4. Data processing without lawful basis

Google has no lawful basis to use my content.
They did not respond to my objection.
They did not investigate my complaint.
They did not fulfill their GDPR obligations.

After my objection, Google lost the "legitimate interest" basis.
Since they did not respond, there is no lawful basis for further processing.
Yet the AI still processes and publishes my content.

Legally, this is clear: Google is using my data without any lawful basis.

Summary

The fourth post closes a legal and logical chain that Google cannot escape from. The registered letters prove official knowledge. The AI's operation proves technical knowledge. Google's lack of response proves negligence. The false statements generated by their system prove deception.

This post closes the story: Google cannot explain how their machine knows about me, but they supposedly "do not."

I have sent this post to Google by email as well. (**The AI Overview isn't a summary – it's a misinterpreting chatbot**)


Gemini-appok Súgó
Súgó Központ – főoldal
Adatvédelmi központ
Gemini-appok
Miben segíthetünk?
Írja le a problémát
Legutóbbi esetek
Dolgozunk az ügyfélszolgálati ügyein
Legal Investigations Support
Esetazonosító 2-6199000041203
Folyamatban
Legutóbb frissítve 38 másodperccel ezelőtt
Legal Investigations Support
Esetazonosító 6-9048000040506
Folyamatban
Legutóbb frissítve 4 hónappal ezelőtt
Kevesebb mutatása
Súgótémakörök tallózása
Népszerű cikkek
A Gemini-appok adatvédelmi központja
pontosido
Pontos idő Budapest
6:01:56
2026.07.01.
27. hét van | 25.6°C
Napfelkelte: 4:50 | Napnyugta 20:44
EUR 355.05
CHF 384.94
USD 311.61
GBP 412.29
Pontos idő
Ezen az oldalon mindig megtudhatod mennyi a pontos idő Budapesten.
Pontos idő Budapesten
Pontos idő Magazin
Pontos idő Londonban
Pontos idő Telefonszám
Világóra
Óraátállítás 2026
Időzónák
Munkaszüneti napok 2026
Húsvét 2026
Pünkösd 2026
Hanyadik hét van
Páros vagy páratlan hét van
Bérkalkulátor
Szabadság kalkulátor
Adatvédelmi tájékoztató
Pontos idő főoldal
Mai névnap
Napi horoszkóp
2026


Gmail
Keresés a levelek között
Bővítés
Levélírás
Beérkező levelek
Csillagozott
Elhalasztott
Fontos
Elküldött
Piszkozatok
Vásárlások
Közösségi
Frissítések
Fórumok
Promóciók
További
Címkék
[2-6199000041203] Your request from Google
Convert to PDF
lis-noreply@google.com
címzett: én
Hello,
Thank you for contacting us. This is an automatic response to let you know that we've received your request and we'll respond as soon as possible.
We treat requests seriously and we review them in the order in which they're received. If you send multiple requests, it might take us longer to respond to you.
Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.
Regards,
Google
Válasz
Továbbítás



If you still fail to respond, you will face serious consequences in court

Convert to PDF

György Istókovics <istokovicsgyorgy79@gmail.com>
címzett: dpo-google, data-protection-office

4:00 (0 percccel ezelőtt)

Dear Google Data Protection Officer,

I am sending the following again, and I will include it in my public post as well.

Google knows about me both officially and technically, yet acts as if I do not exist. This is legally indefensible.

1. The machine's knowledge = Google's knowledge
The AI is a machine operated by Google, running on Google's servers, and part of Google's system.
Therefore, if the machine knows about me, then Google knows about me.
Information processed by the AI constitutes Google's knowledge.

2. Google's system gives the public a false impression
The AI makes statements in Google's name such as "Google handles this" or "Google responds to this," while in reality Google does nothing.
This is deceptive corporate communication.

3. The amount and weight of the evidence
– 38 posts on their own forum
– Signed, officially received registered letters
– Months of failure to respond
– Continuous AI processing and publication of my content

This is not an administrative error. It is intentional ignoring.

4. Data processing without lawful basis
I did not give consent.
I objected.
Google did not respond.
They did not investigate my complaint.
They did not fulfill their GDPR obligations.
Yet the AI still processes and publishes my content.

Legally, this is clear: Google is using my data without any lawful basis.

5. And here is the essential point I highlight explicitly:
If Google still does not respond after this, they will be in **serious trouble in court**, because the evidence clearly demonstrates intentional negligence, deception, and unlawful data processing.

https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148

Bitu79 7 July 1, 2026, 4:08am

https://web.archive.org/web/20260701040534/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148/6

https://archive.ph/dDdo1

https://archive.ph/dDdo1/image

Bitu79 8 July 1, 2026, 4:16am

https://archive.org/details/fire-shot-capture-410-the-ai-overview-isnt-a-summary-its-a-misinterpreting-chatb

---

Bitu79 9 July 1, 2026, 4:23am

Google cannot deny receiving the email — their own system log proves it.





Bitu79 10 July 1, 2026, 4:48am

https://web.archive.org/web/20260701042401/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148/9

https://archive.ph/ZgNPC

https://archive.ph/ZgNPC/image

Bitu79 11 July 1, 2026, 8:15am

I think the whole Google AI Overview concept is fundamentally unacceptable because an AI only works “fine” as long as it runs in a private chat, where it has no official role, no legal consequences, and no responsibility

for what it says. In a private chat I'm just talking to it, it doesn't have to be official, it doesn't have to be source-accurate, and it doesn't influence people's decisions. The Google search engine, however, is not a private environment but a public, official system where people look for information, make decisions, and where every piece of output can have real consequences. If an AI is placed into such a surface, it is no longer chatting, it is performing a function, and that is a completely different situation.

The web contains everything: legal content, medical content, financial content, official documents, complaints, court rulings, copyrighted material, dangerous nonsense, conspiracy theories, trolling, and manipulated content. The AI cannot distinguish any of this because it does not see, does not understand, does not verify, does not know what is true or false, what is official or dangerous, what has consequences, what is legal, medical, financial, or manipulated. It does not summarize, it does not interpret, it simply generates a new text based on statistical patterns. A statistical parrot cannot summarize the web because the web is not a clean, safe, homogeneous space but a chaotic mixture of everything, and the output will inevitably be distorted. A distorted output is unsuitable for summarization because a summary must be source-accurate, consistent, and verifiable, and the AI is not capable of that.

Google's AI Overview does not return the actual search results, does not show the source, does not show the link, but instead generates its own text. That means it is not telling me what it sees, but what it statistically predicts. This is absurd, because it looks like it is "telling me what it sees," while in reality it sees nothing. In a private chat this might still be acceptable because there are no consequences, but in the public Google search engine it is not acceptable at all, because everything shown there carries weight.

The AI has no brakes, no limits, no legal framework. Tesla's autopilot at least brakes, disables itself, warns the user, refuses to continue, and follows the law. Google's AI Overview does not brake, does not stop, does not warn, does not shut itself off, and does not limit itself. That is why I say the situation is worse at Google, because the AI has no brakes.

Google does not take responsibility for the AI's output. They officially state that the AI may make mistakes and that they do not take responsibility for what it says. This means the AI can be wrong, Google does not take responsibility, the AI cannot take responsibility, and in the end nobody takes responsibility. This is legally impossible, because if a system can make mistakes, someone must take responsibility for it. If nobody does, the entire operation becomes untenable. That is why I ask, with full justification: how does this "help" anyone if they take no responsibility for its operation?

The Google search engine is not a private chat but a public surface where people make real decisions. If I do not get actual search results there, but instead a distorted, generated text without responsibility, without brakes, without limits, then the entire operation is technologically unsuitable, logically absurd, and legally indefensible. Summarizing the search results is unlawful because the AI technology is not capable of doing it, and Google does not take responsibility for it. A statistical parrot cannot summarize the web, and that is why the entire AI Overview concept is unsuitable for the purpose they are using it for.

Bitu79 12 July 1, 2026, 8:18am

https://web.archive.org/web/20260701081646/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148

Bitu79 13 July 1, 2026, 10:17am

Court of Munich – Case number: 26 O 869/26 – June 2026

The court ruled that Google's AI Overview creates new content, not summaries.

AI cannot summarize because it does not understand the content.

AI cannot see the web, cannot interpret meaning, cannot identify relevance, cannot know what is true or false.

AI does not quote, does not reproduce, does not comprehend. It only generates text from statistical patterns.

AI cannot "give back" the web. It only attempts to summarize, and that attempt can fail.

AI should not do this automatically, because summarization requires expertise, objectivity, and legal responsibility.

AI cannot make decisions, and must not make decisions.

Summarization requires decisions. Therefore AI cannot be called a summarizer.

AI cannot self-verify. It cannot detect when it is wrong, misleading, or distorted.

A summary influences decisions. If the summary is wrong, the one who summarized badly is responsible.

This is exactly what the court recognized: this is new content generation, not summarization.

Google still claims it is a "summary," which makes Google legally responsible, because summarization is a legal category that implies human decision-making.

This is why Google's appeal is pointless. There is nothing to base it on.

If it is a summary → Google is responsible.

If it is not a summary → it is new content → Google is responsible.

Google's only argument in the appeal:

"AI Overview is just a web summary, not new content."

But AI does not understand, does not decide, does not verify, does not see the web, makes mistakes, and generates new content.

There is nothing left to argue.

Bitu79 14 July 1, 2026, 10:22am

https://archive.ph/kZObo

https://archive.ph/kZObo/image

Kim_Nilsson 15 July 1, 2026, 2:04pm

Thanks for that Munich reference.

Bitu79 16 July 1, 2026, 2:08pm

Of course I included it — because this ruling is something you can actually use to take action against Google.

Bitu79 17 July 1, 2026, 5:35pm

The AI quotes its own critic as a "fact," and this is the biggest failure of Google's AI Overview

I showed a link to Google's Search AI.
I didn't tell it who I am.
I didn't tell it that *I* wrote the forum post.
I didn't tell it that the entire thread is mine.
I just pasted the link and asked the AI to "analyze it".

And what happened next is absolutely insane.

The Search AI **quoted my own forum post back to me** as if it were an external, independent, objective source from the web.
On the right side, under the Google logo, it displayed **my post** as a "referenced source".
On the left side, it was talking to me.
On the right side, it was quoting me.

Left side: my question.
Right side: my criticism.
Left side: my conversation.
Right side: my Munich court reference.
Left side: me.
Right side: also me.

And the AI had **no idea** that I was the author.

This is not a misunderstanding.
This is not a UI glitch.
This is not "AI hallucination".
This is a **self-referential source collapse** inside Google Search AI.

The system does not understand that the source is:

- a forum post,
- written by a user,
- criticizing Google,
- documenting a legal case,
- describing GDPR issues,
- and created by the same person who is currently chatting with it.

It treats my post as if it were a neutral, verified, external fact from the internet.

Why?
Because Google's Search AI cannot admit confusion.
It cannot say "I don't know".
It cannot say "I don't understand this context".

It cannot say “this is a user’s opinion”.
It cannot say “this is your own text”.

So instead, it **pretends to understand**, and confidently quotes my own words back to me as “independent information”.

This is not an AI Overview problem.
This is a **Search AI problem** — Google’s main product, the most heavily monitored system they have.

And yet:

It analyzed my own post and presented it to me as if the internet said it.

So here is the conclusion, in first person:

Google’s Search AI quoted my own post back to me because it didn’t know I was the author — and it pretended it understood the content.

I will attach the full screenshot below so everyone can see how Google’s Search AI ends up analyzing its own source without realizing it.







Bitu79 18 July 1, 2026, 5:42pm

https://web.archive.org/web/20260701173910/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-ai-overview-isn-t-a-summary-it-s-a-misinterpreting-chatbot/173148/17

https://archive.ph/Gz0Vv

https://archive.ph/Gz0Vv/image

---

crystalwizard 19 July 2, 2026, 5:43pm

i'm terribly sorry @bitu79, but if you did not know that the AI summary is gemini flash reacting to your search query as it does any other prompt, but with more access to the google database than say, chatGPT - then i don't know what to tell you. That IS what it is, and just about everyone knows this - google has made Gemini convient by doing this - placing flash it can automatically see the prompt and react if the user wants, rather than the user having to go to apps.gemini and ask it there.

The fact you somehow did not know this, and apparently also did not know it was gemini flash doing it - makes me wonder just how technical you are, and what you are doing on the google developers' forums

---

Bitu79 20 July 2, 2026, 6:03pm

Did you actually read my post? Your reply doesn't relate to anything I wrote. Please make sure you understand the content before responding.

The model has such 'great access' that it digs out my real name, my nickname, my car's license plate, even searches the internet for me based on my ID card and profiles me. Sure, the internet is big — but this kind of operation is not legal, where the system profiles a person based on their personal data. You don't even understand my post, you just show up here to act smart.

Bitu79 21 July 2, 2026, 6:55pm

> crystalwizard:
>
> i'm terribly sorry @bitu79 , but if you did not know that the AI summary is gemini flash reacting to your search query as it does any other prompt, but with more access to the google database than say, chatGPT - then i don't know what to tell you. That IS what it is, and just about everyone knows this - google has made Gemini convient by doing this - placing flash it can automatically see the prompt and react if the user wants, rather than the user having to go to apps.gemini and ask it there.
>
> The fact you somehow did not know this, and apparently also did not know it was gemini flash doing it - makes me wonder just how technical you are, and what you are doing on the google developers' forums

I'm talking about the protection of personal data, and you show up here claiming this is just a search function. They really washed your brain Google 'embedded' a data-mining chatbot into the search engine — that still doesn't make reconstructing my identity legal. Don't give me a lecture about how LLMs work, I know very well how they work. Just look at your posts — go back to your little bubble with your antigravity-Gemini-Flash obsession. You don't read, you just mindlessly project your own fixation onto others. Saying 'the summary exists so you don't have to ask separately' — that was the golden quote of the day…

I'll upload it to the Internet Archive, xD.

Bitu79 22 July 2, 2026, 7:01pm

https://archive.org/details/the-ai-overview-isnt-a-summary-its-a-misinterpreting-chatbot-gemini-api-google-ai-developers-forum

https://archive.ph/sYxwc

https://archive.ph/sYxwc/image

---

crystalwizard 23 July 3, 2026, 3:19am

[quote="Bitu79, post:21, topic:173148"]
Google 'embedded' a data-mining chatbot into the search engine
[/quote] - 1. that's very little of what you ranted about and 2. google has always had data mining going every time you search

---

Bitu79 24 July 3, 2026, 3:34am

> crystalwizard:
>
> Google 'embedded' a data-mining chatbot into the search engine
> [/quote] - 1. that's very little of what you ranted about and 2. google has always had data mining going every time you search

When you say "Google has always done data mining," you're mixing up two completely different things. Basic search telemetry is not the same as identity-based profiling or fused personal data. What I described in my post has nothing to do with the normal data collection Google has always done. You misunderstood the point.

Don’t reply to my thread anymore. I won’t respond further, so please stop posting here.

Bitu79 25 July 3, 2026, 3:41am

https://archive.org/details/the-ai-overview-isnt-a-summary-its-a-misinterpreting-chatbot-gemini-api-google-ai-developers-forum-2

Bitu79 26 July 3, 2026, 3:55am

Basic search telemetry is not the same as identity-based profiling. You can’t distinguish between Google measuring how many times someone clicks a link (telemetry) and a generative AI independently drawing conclusions and synthesizing an entirely new, false narrative from a user’s real-world name and supposedly deleted online history.

Don’t reply to my thread anymore. I won’t respond further, so please stop posting here.

Related topics

Topic	Replies	Views	Activity
AI Overview Content Theft Report – Google Is Re-Generating My Posts Without Proper Attribution gemini	15	104	July 1, 2026

Topic	Replies	Views	Activity
AI-powered overview" is a mathematical contradiction: It's not a summary, it's an amnesiac chatbot gemini	3	27	July 2, 2026
AI Overview = hidden Gemini chatbot that collects and links my personal information gemini-api	11	147	June 23, 2026
Video & Screenshot Evidence: Google AI Overview Commits Automated Defamation by Synthesizing False Contexts gemini-api	9	116	June 7, 2026
Your AI Overview is profiling me. This is not a "helpful assistant", this is identity reconstruction gemini-api	9	273	June 4, 2026